

Weekly report

1 Done

1.1 Vast Modification

The red part is not done yet.

1. Better describe motivation, design process, and unique selling point of the system. [R2,R3,R4]

As mentioned by Reviewer 2, we added application scenario (providing privacy preservation before sharing data) as motivation, as well as selling point of the system. Design process

2. Give motivation behind individual design choices. [R3,R4]

On this issue, Reviewer 3 raised a question about the choice of common metrics for the hub fingerprint. Actually, the three metrics are selected by users in the priority view. We consider that they play an important role to the graph. So, our system automatically provides these metrics. This reason is now explained in the second paragraph about the hub fingerprint protector.

Besides, we emphasized the links between views and task requirements, when describing our visual designs. We think this improvement can facilitate readers in understanding our design choices.

On the other hand, Reviewer 4 raised a series of question about our algorithm. The reason why we achieved privacy preservation only by adding edges and not remove them is that employing both schemes simultaneously may cause conflict. For example, the later processing may remove the edges added in the previous processing. Besides, we choose adding edges rather than removing edges, because adding edges helps protect characteristics, like high degree. We have provided details in the Section 4.2.

3. Improve the reporting of the evaluation. [R2,R3]

We have reorganized both Section 6 (case studies) and Section 7.1 (expert reviews). We introduced more details on the results of two case studies.

4. Assess and discuss the limitations of the tool in an honest and complete manner (low-level vs. high-level utility [R1], false sense of privacy [R4], scalability and usability issues [R5] etc.).

We have added high-level utility evaluation to our system. Related information can be found in the second part (Other Changes). In Section 7.3, we discussed

scalability from the perspectives of visual expression and algorithm efficiency.

false sense of privacy

5. **State clearly that the tool is a first attempt to establishing very basic privacy protection in a visual manner. It does not provide full anonymity and using knowledge about another graph with the same user set, the users of an anonymized dataset can likely be re-identified. [R4].**

In the section 8, we explained the limitation of our system from two aspects: resisting partial attacks and focusing on only simple graphs. We also consider them in our future work.

6. **Provide more information on the utility aspects [R1,R5]**

system improvement

7. **Revise the writing of the paper for a more precise wording (semi-run, scrubbing, etc.), a clear structure (Sec.2, Sec.5.2,...) , and short inline explanations/definitions that clarify terms on the spot (k-anonymity, utility,...)**

We did our best to improve writing. Thanks reviewers for your patience to pointing out our typos.

1.2 T-ITS Modification

I have received the reviews. We got 2 “reject” and 3 “minor revision”. They asked us to re-submit the paper within 90 days.

Their reviews can be summarized as following:

- Describe experiment environment, including simulation setting, hardware and software information.
- Add related works published in T-ITS.
- Providing guidelines in detail.
- Title: Human capability to infer specific location of individual trajectories enriched with certain geo-based feature
- Re-organize introduction and highlight visualization.
- Privacy-preserving schemes should be something like cryptographic data transformations, rather than geo-based features.

Besides, a reviewer rejected our paper, but provided no reviews.

1.3 Interview the Interns

2 Progress

Item	Deadline	Current progress	Remark
Vast modification	6.27	More than half writing improvements are done.	
T-ITS modification	9.15	Summarize reviews.	
Privacy program	10.31	Surveying.	Pausing.